

THE HON. MARSHA J. PECHMAN

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

TRAVIS MICKELOSON, DANIELLE H.
MICKELOSON, et. ux.

NO. 2:11-cv-01445

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

CHASE HOME FINANCE LLC, et. al.

[PROPOSED]

Defendants.

THIS MATTER came before the Court upon the Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to LCR

7. This Court has reviewed the Motion and attachments thereto, filed in this matter

and:

— 1 —

1. The Motion is GRANTED

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION - 1**

STAFNE LAW FIRM

239 NORTH OLYMPIC AVENUE
ARLINGTON, WA 98223
TEL. 360.403.8700 /STAFNELAWFIRM@AOL.COM

1 2. The Order Granting Motion to Dismiss (April 16, 2012) (dkt. # 58) is amended and
 2 superseded by this Order.

3 3. This Order incorporates by reference dkt. #58, pp. 1:1 to 5:17 herein.

4 4. By failing to challenge the foreclosure and trustee's sale, the Plaintiffs waived any
 5 claims of (1) injunctive relief; (2) breach of contract; (3) unenforceability of the deed
 6 of trust based on unconscionability; and (4) criminal profiteering. Except with respect
 7 to procedural failures at the auction, all three elements required by Plein for waiver to
 8 apply are alleged in the complaint. Plaintiffs received notice of the foreclosure sale,
 9 had knowledge of it, and failed to enjoin the sale. Plein, 149 Wn.2d at 227. As the
 10 Court understands and construes the four claims noted above, each attacks the validity
 11 of the foreclosure and trustee's sale and thus cannot be brought when waived.
 12 Moreover, the exceptions to Plein the Deed of Trust Act carves out do not permit
 13 Plaintiffs to pursue any of these four claims. Allowing any of these claims to move
 14 forward would run contrary to the DTA's intent to limit post-sale remedies and to
 15 promote the stability of land titles. See Plein, 149 Wn.2d at 228. Plaintiffs have
 16 therefore waived these four claims by failing to bring them before the foreclosure sale.
 17 The Court finds that these must be DISMISSED as to all Defendants, including as to
 18 the Defendants who merely joined in the motion to dismiss. The claims are dismissed
 19 with prejudice.

22 However, a common law cause of action exists to void the sale where there
 23 were procedural defects in sale which cannot be known or waived. See, Cox v.
 24 Helenius, 103 Wash. 2d 383, 387, 693 P.2d 683 (1985); Plein, 149 Wash. 2d at 228.
 25 Plaintiffs premise an improper acceptance of a bid in their claims listed under AC ¶¶

1 6.55 – 7.3, as a basis for invalidating the sale and quieting title. The Court finds that
 2 Defendants' motion to dismiss be DENIED with respect to this claim.

3 Furthermore, the Deed of Trust Act permits two claims to go forward: (1) the
 4 CPA claims; and (2) the claims brought under the Deed of Trust Act. However, the
 5 Deed of Trust Act specifies that these post-sale statutory claims premised on
 6 violations of the Act may only be brought against the trustee. Except for Chicago and
 7 NTS, none of the other Defendants are alleged to be a trustee. As such, the claims
 8 premised on DTA violations are DISMISSED as to all defendants except Chicago and
 9 NTS. Although both Chicago and NTS joined in the motion to dismiss, they have not
 10 provided any argument specific to claims against them sufficient for the Court to rule
 11 on whether any claims premised on compliance with the Deed of Trust Act can move
 12 forward.
 13

14 5. This Order incorporates by reference dkt. #58, pp. 6:17 to 11:17 herein.
 15
 16 6. The majority of Plaintiffs' complaint fails to present any tenable claims. The Court
 17 finds the claims for: (1) injunctive relief; breach of contract, (3) unenforceability of
 18 the deed of trust based on unconscionability; and (4) criminal profiteering are all
 19 waived. The Court DISMISSES all of the waived claims with prejudice as to all
 20 Defendant. Defendants' motion is DENIED for Claims for Quiet Title and invalid sale
 21 under AC ¶¶ 6.55 – 7.3. All other DTA claims, AC ¶¶ 6.1 – 6.54 against all defendants
 22 except Chicago and NTS are DISMISSED with prejudice. The Court also
 23 DISMISSES the CPA claims against MERS, Chase, JPMorgan, and Freddie Mac
 24 without prejudice. The Court does not rule on whether the CPA claims against the
 25 other defendants who joined in the motion are adequately pleaded.
 26

1 7. _____
2 _____
3 _____
4 _____
5 _____
6 _____
7 _____
8 _____
9 _____
10 _____
11 _____
12 _____
13 _____
14 _____
15 _____
16 _____
17 _____
18 _____
19 _____
20 _____
21 _____
22 _____
23 _____
24 _____
25 _____
26 _____

The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

Dated this _____ day of _____ 20 ____

Marsha J. Pechman
United States District Judge

Prepared and presented by:

STAFNE LAW FIRM

/s/ Andrew J. Krawczyk _____
Scott E. Stafne, WSBA 6964
Andrew J. Krawczyk, WSBA 42982
Stafne Law Firm
239 N. Olympic Avenue
Arlington, WA 98223
(360) 403-8700
scott.stafne@stafnelawfirm.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs